

when I served in the Wisconsin State Legislature. There, I spearheaded the effort to provide state funds for a lawsuit against the United States Department of Agriculture. Challenging the system, we argued that USDA had no sound and justifiable economic basis for their milk pricing system. The states of Wisconsin and Minnesota, working together, repeated that argument relentlessly in the courts for over ten years in an effort to beat back the system.

In November of last year, the people of Wisconsin and Minnesota won that case. Federal District Judge David Doty ruled in favor of a more equitable dairy pricing system and enjoined the Secretary of Agriculture from enforcing USDA's "arbitrary and capricious" Class I differentials. Madam President, in other words, a federal judge could find no rational justification for this archaic system and ruled the whole scheme illegal.

Although the case is now in the appellate court, I am optimistic that Doty's ruling will be upheld. As I said, Judge Doty found the current pricing system "arbitrary and capricious."

Most recently, the USDA came up with a proposed rule that included two different options to replace the old system: Option 1A is virtually identical to the status quo and is totally unacceptable to the majority of Wisconsin dairy farmers. Option 1B is a modest step in the right direction and a good place to begin reform efforts. I was optimistic when Secretary Glickman announced USDA's proposed rule for milk marketing order reform and his stated preference for Option 1B.

If there was any question of the intense, personal effect this discriminatory policy has on Wisconsin's dairy farmers, I would hope, after visiting with over 500 producers, consumer advocates, and local officials at an informal hearing in Green Bay, that USDA's doubts could be put to rest.

At the USDA listening session in Green Bay, more than 500 people showed up, demanding a fair shake. At the sessions in New York, Georgia and Texas, a total of 240 people showed up. Wisconsin had more than double the attendance than the other locations combined. That difference in attendance didn't happen just because of Wisconsin's tradition of good citizenship. They showed up in Green Bay by the hundreds because they know they are getting a raw deal. Those Wisconsinites showed up to demand reform. They showed up to demand a better system, a chance to preserve economic viability and the opportunity to continue their way of life.

Day after day, season after season, we are losing small farms at an alarming rate. While these operations disappear, we are seeing the emergence of larger dairy farms. The trend toward fewer but larger dairy operations is mirrored in most States throughout the Nation. The economic losses associated with the reduction in the number

of small farms go well beyond the impact on the individual farm families who must wrest themselves from the land.

The loss of these farms has hurt their rural communities, where small family-owned dairy farms are the key to economic stability. They deserve better: we need a system in which their farms are viable and their work can be fairly rewarded.

In conclusion, I will continue to work with Wisconsin family farmers and other concerned Wisconsinites in the fight to preserve and protect our family dairy farms by restoring some semblance of fairness and economic integrity to our outdated, out-of-touch, milk pricing system. In the process, we will save an important piece of American agricultural history and a priceless part of Wisconsin's culture.

As USDA considers Federal Milk Marketing Order reform, I urge the Department to set aside 60 years of inequality and senseless regionalism to do what is best for this nation's dairy industry. These policies are out-of-date, out-of-touch and, frankly, an outrageous way to treat Wisconsin dairy farmers. For those farmers, who are watching as their neighbors sell their livestock to cover their bills and abandon the land of their parents and grandparents, USDA's decision could mean the demise or the survival of their way of life. It is time to do the right thing on dairy pricing policy. Wisconsin farmers demand it, Wisconsin's consumers demand it, and, above all, Justice demands it.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SUSAN OKI MOLLWAY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider the nomination of Susan Oki Mollway to be United States District Judge for the district of Hawaii.

The question occurs on the confirmation of the nomination. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) is absent because of illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 166 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Lugar
Biden	Glenn	Mack
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Gregg	Moynihan
Breaux	Hagel	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Reed
Bumpers	Hatch	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cleland	Inouye	Roth
Cochran	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Daschle	Kerrey	Stevens
DeWine	Kerry	Thompson
Dodd	Kohl	Torricelli
Dorgan	Landrieu	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	

NAYS—34

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Allard	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Burns	Helms	Sessions
Campbell	Hutchinson	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Inhofe	Thurmond
Craig	Kempthorne	Warner
Enzi	Kyl	
Faircloth	Lott	

NOT VOTING—10

Bennett	Leahy	Specter
Chafee	Moseley-Braun	Thomas
D'Amato	Murkowski	
Domenici	Reid	

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. AKAKA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senate will now return to legislative session.

Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending motion and amendments be laid aside and it be in order for me to call up amendment No. 2813 relative to tax compensation at Fort Campbell and no second-degree amendment be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?